UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/535,750	12/19/2005	Alfons Johannes Maria Stams	72998-012700/US	9055
33717 7590 03/06/2008 GREENBERG TRAURIG LLP (LA) 2450 COLORADO AVENUE, SUITE 400E			EXAMINER	
			LILLING, HERBERT J	
	INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY DEPARTMENT SANTA MONICA, CA 90404		ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			1657	
			MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			03/06/2008	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

	Application No.	Applicant(s)				
	10/535,750	STAMS ET AL.				
Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit				
	HERBERT J. LILLING	1657				
The MAILING DATE of this communication app	ears on the cover sheet with the c	orrespondence address				
Period for Reply						
A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DA - Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.13 after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. - If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period w - Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	ATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION 36(a). In no event, however, may a reply be time will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from cause the application to become ABANDONE	N. nely filed the mailing date of this communication. D (35 U.S.C. § 133).				
Status						
1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on May 2	20, 2005 (preliminary amd).					
	action is non-final.					
3) Since this application is in condition for allowar	, 					
closed in accordance with the practice under Ex parte Quayle, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.						
Disposition of Claims						
4)⊠ Claim(s) <u>1-13</u> is/are pending in the application.						
4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdrawn from consideration.						
5) Claim(s) is/are allowed.						
6) Claim(s) is/are rejected.						
7) Claim(s) is/are objected to.						
8)⊠ Claim(s) <u>1-13</u> are subject to restriction and/or e	election requirement.					
Application Papers						
9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examine	r.					
10)⊠ The drawing(s) filed on <u>20 May 2005</u> is/are: a)⊠ accepted or b)□ objected to by the Examiner.						
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).						
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).						
11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.						
Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119						
12)⊠ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).						
a) ☑ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:						
1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No						
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage						
application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).						
* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.						
Attachment(s)						
1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)	4) 🔲 Interview Summary	(PTO-413)				
2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)	Paper No(s)/Mail Da	ate				
3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date	5) Notice of Informal P 6) Other:	ателт Аррисатіол				

Application/Control Number: 10/535,750 Page 2

Art Unit: 1657

1. Receipt is acknowledged of a preliminary amendment which includes amendment to the claims and to the specification pertaining to foreign priority and a prior art information disclosure statement filed December 05, 2005.

2. Claims 1-13 are pending in this application which is a national stage filing under 35 U.S.C. 371 of International Application PCT/NL2003/000818, filed on November 20, 2003 which claims priority from NL Application No: 02079845.0, filed on November 20, 2002.

3. Restriction is required under 35 U.S.C. 121 and 372.

This application contains the following inventions or groups of inventions which are not so linked as to form a single general inventive concept under PCT Rule 13.1.

This is supported by the PCT search report which indicated that Claim 13 invention is not so linked as to form a single general inventive concept under PCT Rule 13.1 in view of the prior art that indicated a lack of an invention.

In accordance with 37 CFR 1.499, applicant is required, in reply to this action, to elect a single invention to which the claims must be restricted.

Group I, claims 1-5, drawn to a process for converting methane to produce hydrogen or hydrogen equivalents, characterized in that methane is subjected anaerobically to the activity of methane-oxidizing bacteria of the order of the Thermotogales or a process for reducing chemical compounds by biological reduction using hydrogen equivalents, characterised in that the hydrogen equivalents are produced by subjecting methane to anaerobic methane-oxidising bacteria of the order of the Thermotogales, classified in Class 435, subclass 168.

Please note that claims 4, 5 and 12 are improper multiple dependent claims.

Application/Control Number: 10/535,750 Page 3

Art Unit: 1657

Group III, claim 13, drawn to a mixed culture, classified in Class 435, subclass 42.

4. Invention I does not require the specifics of Invention III and the product of Invention III is drawn to a mixed culture which product is not required for carrying out the processes of Invention I.

Restriction for examination purposes as indicated is proper because all these inventions listed in this action are independent or distinct for the reasons given above <u>and</u> there would be a serious search and examination burden if restriction were not required because one or more of the following reasons apply:

- (a) the inventions have acquired a separate status in the art in view of their different classification;
- (b) the inventions have acquired a separate status in the art due to their recognized divergent subject matter;
- (c) the inventions require a different field of search (for example, searching different classes/subclasses or electronic resources, or employing different search queries);
- (d) the prior art applicable to one invention would not likely be applicable to another invention;
- (e) the inventions are likely to raise different non-prior art issues under 35 U.S.C.101 and/or 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph.
- 5. Applicant is advised that the reply to this requirement to be complete must include (i) an election of a invention to be examined even though the requirement may be traversed (37 CFR 1.143) and (ii) identification of the claims encompassing the elected invention.

The election of an invention may be made with or without traverse. To reserve a right to petition, the election must be made with traverse. If the reply does not distinctly and specifically point out supposed errors in the restriction requirement, the election shall be treated as an election without traverse. Traversal must be presented at the time of election in order to be considered timely. Failure to timely traverse the requirement will result in the loss of right to petition under 37 CFR 1.144. If claims are added after the election, applicant must indicate which of these claims are readable on the elected invention.

If claims are added after the election, applicant must indicate which of these claims are readable upon the elected invention.

Should applicant traverse on the ground that the inventions are not patentably distinct, applicant should submit evidence or identify such evidence now of record showing the inventions to be obvious variants or clearly admit on the record that this is the case. In either instance, if the examiner finds one of the inventions unpatentable over the prior art, the evidence or admission may be used in a rejection under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) of the other invention.

6. Applicant is reminded that upon the cancellation of claims to a non-elected invention, the inventorship must be amended in compliance with 37 CFR 1.48(b) if one or more of the currently named inventors is no longer an inventor of at least one claim remaining in the application. Any amendment of inventorship must be accompanied by a request under 37 CFR 1.48(b) and by the fee required under 37 CFR 1.17(i).

7. The examiner has required restriction between product and process claims. Where applicant elects claims directed to the product, and the product claims are subsequently found allowable, withdrawn process claims that depend from or otherwise require all the limitations of the allowable product claim will be considered for rejoinder. All claims directed to a nonelected process invention must require all the limitations of an allowable product claim for that process invention to be rejoined.

Page 5

In the event of rejoinder, the requirement for restriction between the product claims and the rejoined process claims will be withdrawn, and the rejoined process claims will be fully examined for patentability in accordance with 37 CFR 1.104. Thus, to be allowable, the rejoined claims must meet all criteria for patentability including the requirements of 35 U.S.C. 101, 102, 103 and 112. Until all claims to the elected product are found allowable, an otherwise proper restriction requirement between product claims and process claims may be maintained. Withdrawn process claims that are not commensurate in scope with an allowable product claim will not be rejoined. See MPEP § 821.04(b). Additionally, in order to retain the right to rejoinder in accordance with the above policy, applicant is advised that the process claims should be amended during prosecution to require the limitations of the product claims. Failure to do so may result in a loss of the right to rejoinder. Further, note that the prohibition against double patenting rejections of 35 U.S.C. 121 does not apply where the restriction requirement is withdrawn by the examiner before the patent issues. See MPEP § 804.01.

Application/Control Number: 10/535,750 Page 6

Art Unit: 1657

8. The specification has not been checked to the extent necessary to

determine the presence of all possible minor errors. Applicant's cooperation is

requested in correcting any errors of which applicant may become aware in the

specification.

9. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to HERBERT J. LILLING whose telephone number is

571-272-0918. The examiner can normally be reached on WORK AT HOME

MAXIFLEX.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, JON WEBER can be reached on 571-272-0925. The fax phone number for

the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

H.J.Lilling: HJL (571) 272-0918 Art Unit <u>1657</u> February 26, 2008

> /HERBERT J LILLING/ Primary Examiner, Art Unit 1657